The Rockefeller Foundation, the Social Sciences, and the Humanities in the Cold War

✣ Tim B. Mueller

The Rockefeller Foundation (RF), a private grant-making institution, has long been characterized as part of the U.S. Cold War establishment.[1] However, the impact of the early Cold War on the foundation's patronage of the social sciences and humanities has gone largely unexplored. The protagonists within and outside the RF were well aware of the inconsistencies and contradictions that sprang from the foundation's involvement in the political and academic worlds. This is not merely the insight of later critical historical accounts, some having rather misconstrued and simplified the complex relationship of politics and the social sciences in the Cold War. What is intriguing, and still in need of an adequate explanation, is the ease with which RF officers and their advisers and trustees balanced the two systems.

Participants in the RF's discussions in the 1940s and early 1950s included notable political figures such as Dean Acheson, George F. Kennan, and the Dulles brothers (Allen and John Foster). In 1950 the foundation's assistant director of humanities, John Marshall, tried to work out a formula that would enable the RF to function normally in the age of anti-Communism, McCarthyism, and the Cold War.[2] Connecting the RF's past, present, and future political strategies, he argued that the foundation must remain committed to the "well-being of mankind." The liberal internationalism of this slo-

1. Five decades ago, the historian Arthur Schlesinger wrote that the "New York financial and legal community . . . was the heart of the American Establishment. Its household deities were Henry L. Stimson and Elihu Root; its present leaders, Robert A. Lovett and John J. McCloy; its front organizations, the Rockefeller, Ford, and Carnegie foundations and the Council on Foreign Relations; its organs, the *New York Times* and *Foreign Affairs*." See Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *A Thousand Days: John F. Kennedy in the White House* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), p. 128.

2. John Marshall's crucial role in defining RF policies has only recently come to the fore. See William J. Buxton, "John Marshall and the Humanities in Europe: Shifting Patterns of Rockefeller Foundation Support," *Minerva,* Vol. 41, Issue 2 (June 2003), pp. 133–153; and Brett Gary, *The Nervous Liberals: Propaganda Anxieties from World War I to the Cold War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), pp. 85–129.

Journal of Cold War Studies
Vol. 15, No. 3, Summer 2013, pp. 108–135, doi:10.1162/JCWS_a_00372
© 2013 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology

gan, however, was easily reconciled with the U.S. national interest, as Marshall emphasized in November 1950: "Obligations to American government and to American national interest are axiomatic for the Foundation and its officers. And it is within the limits they impose that the Foundation's reputation for disinterestedness in its international work has been established."[3] For him, it was no big step from internationalist philanthropy to Cold War strategy. The ideas behind this view and the practices resulting from it are addressed in this article. To be sure, important precedents existed in the debates and research policies dating from World War II. Solutions similar to the early Cold War–era policies were developed then.[4] Yet, despite these continuities, the more global approach of the postwar years, analyzed here, reflected important changes in the postwar era, especially the hegemonic position of the United States in the West and the bipolarity of the international system.

The ongoing scholarly debate about science and the Cold War, particularly the role of philanthropic foundations and universities in supporting the social sciences, has long been characterized by the construction of binaries, such as anti-Communism versus academic freedom or the state versus the university.[5] Although these arguments may be partly valid, recent research has shown the need for a more nuanced and ambivalent picture. Centers of scientific and scholarly innovation emerged with the help of state patronage, but the Cold War was also notable for the widespread political self-mobilization of academics.[6] Archival materials contain seemingly paradoxical

3. "Pro-51: Marshall, Relations of the Foundation with Governmental and Intergovernmental Agencies," 3 November 1950, p. 4, in Rockefeller Foundation Archives (RFA), Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY, Record Group (RG) 3.2, Series 900, Box 29, Folder 159. On this debate, see Tim B. Müller, *Krieger und Gelehrte: Herbert Marcuse und die Denksysteme im Kalten Krieg* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2010), pp. 259–272.

4. See Buxton, "John Marshall"; Gary, *The Nervous Liberals,* pp. 85–129; and Brett Gary, "Communications Research, the Rockefeller Foundation, and Mobilization for the War on Words, 1938–1944," *Journal of Communication,* Vol. 46, No. 3 (1996), pp. 124–148.

5. See, for example, Ellen Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower: McCarthyism and the Universities* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Sigmund Diamond, *Compromised Campus: The Collaboration of Universities with the Intelligence Community, 1945–1955* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992); Noam Chomsky et al., eds., *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years* (New York: The New Press, 1997); Christopher Simpson, ed., *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences during the Cold War* (New York: New Press, 1998); and Jessica Wang, *American Science in an Age of Anxiety: Scientists, Anticommunism, and the Cold War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999). An insightful review of this earlier literature is Corinna R. Unger, "Cold War Science: Wissenschaft, Politik und Ideologie im Kalten Krieg," *Neue Politische Literatur,* Vol. 51 (2006), pp. 49–68.

6. For an excellent overview, see the group of articles organized by Hunter Heyck and David Kaiser under the rubric "New Perspectives on Science in the Cold War," *Isis,* Vol. 101, No. 2 (June 2010), pp. 362–411, esp. David C. Engerman's contribution, "Social Science in the Cold War," pp. 393–400. See also Joel Isaac, "The Human Sciences in Cold War America," *Historical Journal,* Vol. 50 (2007), pp. 725–746; and Ulrike Jureit, "Wissenschaft und Politik: Der lange Weg zu einer Wissen-

statements, statements that integrate what appear to be opposite things. No clear "state versus the academic world" divide actually existed. The RF was a key actor both in the Cold War political-academic nexus and in the system of science and scholarship patronage. Some scholars even speak of a "Rockefeller Half-Century."[7]

In this article, I examine the activities of the RF during the early Cold War. My discussion focuses on the 1940s and 1950s and does not extend beyond the mid-1960s, the "high modern" Cold War period, as some historians have come to call it.[8] The notion that an authoritarian tendency was inherent in high modernity, as some influential authors have argued, is unconvincing. According to James C. Scott, a "muscle-bound . . . self-confidence about scientific and technical progress, the expansion of production, the growing satisfaction of human needs, the mastery of nature (including human nature), and above all, the rational design of social order" were part of high-modernist visions of society, and traditional divisions—whatever these may have been—between the political left and right were blurred, and state power was used in pursuing desired changes.[9] However, these processes did not need to result in authoritarian "social engineering" and violent standardization. To the contrary, certain high-modernist visions had a liberal-pluralist horizon, as this article argues. One could easily make the case for a liberal high modernity, if "high modernity" remains the term of choice. At the very least, we need to allow for ambiguities. Important features of high modernity in this sense were the increasing intellectual self-observation of societies—most prominently characterized by the social science's quest for systems and integration; large-scale and centrally (but not violently) enforced projects of social reform; for localized and individualized programs of reform; the (neo-)corporatist balanc-

schaftsgeschichte der 'Ostforschung,'" *Neue Politische Literatur,* Vol. 55 (2010), pp. 71–88. Important examples are Rebecca S. Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997); Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003); and David C. Engerman, *Know Your Enemy: The Rise and Fall of America's Soviet Experts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).

7. William J. Buxton, "From the Rockefeller Center to the Lincoln Center: Musing on the 'Rockefeller Half-Century,'" in William J. Buxton, ed., *Patronizing the Public: American Philanthropy's Transformation of Culture, Communication, and the Humanities* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009), pp. 23–41.

8. Odd Arne Westad, "The Cold War and the International History of the Twentieth Century," in Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Cold War,* Vol. 1 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 16–17; and Ulrich Herbert, "Europe in High Modernity: Reflections on a Theory of the 20th Century," *Journal of Modern European History,* Vol. 5, No. 3 (2007), pp. 5–20.

9. On the influential characterization of "high modernity," see James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), pp. 4–6.

ing of capital, labor, and the state; and the "Keynesian" welfare-state governance of economy and society.[10]

The article begins with a brief overview of RF policies and grants during the early Cold War; it then discusses political issues related to philanthropic practices during that period. The article then highlights two specific RF projects in the humanities and social sciences that exemplify the political and intellectual features of the high modern Cold War years. The concluding section uses the analysis presented here to reflect on the nature of modernity, modernization, and the Cold War.[11]

Cold War Philanthropy: The RF after World War II

Immediately after World War II, Raymond B. Fosdick, president of the RF and a veteran of Woodrow Wilson's administration, took stock of the foundation's recent activities. Hiroshima appeared to have changed everything. Before and during the war, the foundation had supported the construction of cyclotrons, once celebrated as a "mighty symbol, a token of man's hunger for knowledge, an emblem of the undiscourageable search for truth which is the noblest expression of the human spirit." "But it is this same search for truth," Fosdick continued,

> that has today brought our civilization to the edge of the abyss, and man is confronted by the tragic irony that when he has been most successful in pushing out the boundaries of knowledge, he has most endangered the possibility of human life on this planet. The pursuit of truth has at last led us to the tools by which we can ourselves become the destroyers of our own institutions and all the bright hopes of the race. In this situation what are we to do—curb our science, or cling to the pursuit of truth and run the risk of returning our society to barbarism?[12]

Fosdick described a dialectics-of-enlightenment kind of process and argued that philanthropic commitment had not lost its vital importance. He insisted

10. On the merits and weaknesses of the concept of "high modernity," see Lutz Raphael, "Ordnungsmuster der 'Hochmoderne'? Die Theorie der Moderne und die Geschichte der europäischen Gesellschaften im 20. Jahrhundert," in Ute Schneider and Lutz Raphael, eds., *Dimensionen der Moderne* (Frankfurt: Lang, 2008), pp. 73–92. In addition, Howard Brick, *Transcending Capitalism: Visions of a New Society in Modern American Thought* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006), deals cogently with a social-liberal key intellectual discourse of the high modern period. See also Hunter Heyck, "Moderne und sozialer Wandel in der amerikanischen Sozialwissenschaft," in Bernd Greiner, Tim B. Müller, and Claudia Weber, eds., *Macht und Geist im Kalten Krieg* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2011), pp. 159–179.

11. For a more detailed discussion of these issues, see Müller, *Krieger und Gelehrte,* chs. 2–5.

12. Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report 1945* (New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1946), p. 7.

that the dawning new age of global competition, which soon became known as the Cold War, meant that the foundation had to be more active than ever. Fosdick reclaimed and rhetorically secured the RF's range of operation by explaining that not only science and traditional philanthropic fields such as medical aid called for special support. The foundation, he stated, must also target neglected areas like "cultural understanding" and cosmopolitan learning. "Humanistic and social studies" held a key to achieving the foundation's noblest goal, the promotion of the "well-being" of humankind:

> The mighty imperative of our time . . . is not to curb science but to stop war—or, to put it in another way, to create the conditions which will foster peace. That is a job in which everybody must participate, including the scientists. But the bomb on Hiroshima suddenly woke us up to the fact that perhaps we have very little time.[13]

Although the social sciences had received substantial funding from the RF prior to the Cold War—among other things, RF money allowed the creation of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC)—the foundation's involvement with the humanities increased considerably after World War II.[14] The RF, founded in 1913 and reorganized in 1928 and 1929, still gave most of its support to the medical, agricultural, and natural sciences, as well as to general education and public health projects in different parts of the world. In the early post-1945 period, things began to change. In 1947, the year that marks the beginning of the Cold War according to many narratives, the RF spent a total of $23.4 million on grants—$13.75 million on medical science and public health projects, $1.7 million on the natural sciences, $3.0 million on the social sciences, $1.5 million on the General Education Board (a Rockefeller family philanthropy committed to the development of the American South by creating better educational opportunities, universities, and agricultural training and improving living conditions for African Americans), and another $1.5 million on the humanities. This last amount, however, included larger grants toward literature and arts projects and for public libraries.[15]

13. Ibid., pp. 10–11.

14. From 1923 to 1950, the SSRC received $2 million from the RF. In 1951, the RF supported the SSRC with a $1.5 million endowment and a $270,000 grant. See Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report 1951* (New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1952), pp. 59–60. On the SSRC, see Donald Fisher, *Fundamental Development of the Social Sciences: Rockefeller Philanthropy and the United States Social Science Research Council* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993). For a discussion of the RF's involvement with the rise of behavioralist social science and modernization theory, see Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future,* pp. 113–154. On the international interwar activities of the RF, see Helke Rausch, "US-amerikanische 'Scientific Philanthropy' in Frankreich, Deutschland und Großbritannien zwischen den Weltkriegen," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft,* Vol. 33, No. 1 (2007), pp. 73–98.

15. Numbers are from Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report 1947* (New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1948).

Shortly after World War II, RF officers and advisers considered lessons from the immediate past and plans for the near future.[16] They hoped to devise a consistent set of principles and policies for the postwar world.[17] Several scholars have scrutinized the foundation's work during this period, looking in particular at the physical sciences and large-scale RF projects.[18] In the social sciences, the behavioralist approach was gaining ascendancy. Earlier studies have shown—and may occasionally have exaggerated—how behavioralism, as a universalistic, quantitative, ahistorical, and psychology-based approach, interlocked with early Cold War discourses such as conceptions of "the end of ideology."[19] The RF, for its part, briefly considered subsuming all social science support under the behavioralist paradigm.[20]

16. On World War Two precedents, see Buxton, "John Marshall"; Gary, "Communication Research"; Gary, *The Nervous Liberals,* pp. 85–129; and, more generally, Buxton, ed., *Patronizing the Public.*

17. For example, see "Pro-37: Agreements and Announcements Concerning Policy and Program of The Rockefeller Foundation," 12 March 1946; "Pro-40: Plans for Future Work of The Rockefeller Foundation, November 1944, used as basis for discussion at Trustees' meeting," 4 April 1945; "Pro-41a: Report of the Special Committee on Program and Policy," 3 and 4 December 1946; "Pro 41a–c, Special Committee on Program and Policy, Reports," 1946–1947; "Pro-41: General Program and Policy, Working Papers," 1946; all in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 900, Boxes 23–24, Folders 173–179. See also Dean Rusk, "Notes on Rockefeller Foundation Program," 1 December 1953, in RFA, RG. 3.2, Series 900, Box 29, Folder 158; and Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report 1948* (New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1949), pp. 8–11.

18. On Europe, see John Krige, *American Hegemony and the Postwar Reconstruction of Science in Europe* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006). See also Giuliana Gemelli, ed., *American Foundations and Large Scale Research: Construction and Transfer of Knowledge* (Bologna: Clueb, 2001); Benjamin B. Page and David A. Valone, eds., *Philanthropic Foundations and the Globalization of Scientific Medicine and Public Health* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2007); and William B. Schneider, ed., *Rockefeller Philanthropy and Modern Biomedicine: International Initiatives from World War I to the Cold War* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002).

19. See Ellen Herman, *The Romance of American Psychology: Political Culture in the Age of Experts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Ellen Herman, "The Career of Cold War Psychology," *Radical History Review,* Vol. 63 (1995), pp. 52–85; Ron Robin, *The Making of the Cold War Enemy: Culture and Politics in the Military-Intellectual Complex* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001); Ellen Schrecker, *Many Are the Crimes: McCarthyism in America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998), pp. 404, 407–408; and Peter J. Seybold, "The Ford Foundation and the Triumph of Behavioralism in American Political Science," in Robert F. Arnove, ed., *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism: The Foundations at Home and Abroad* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980), pp. 269–303. On Talcott Parsons and the Harvard Department of Social Relations—important for the rise of the idea of a "universal" social science based on behavioralist principles—see Brick, *Transcending Capitalism,* pp. 121–151; and Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future,* pp. 72–112.

20. For some examples of the expression of decisively pro-behavioralist RF policy, see "Pro-40: Carl I. Hovland, Some Suggested Research Opportunities in Social Psychology, Sociology, and Anthropology," 13 May 1946, in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 910, Box 3, Folder 19; "Pro-39: Willits, Social Sciences and Social Studies," 25 April 1952, in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 910, Box 3, Folder 19; Buchanan, "Notes on Rockefeller Foundation Program in the Social Sciences," August 1955, in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 910, Box 3, Folder 19; and "Social Relations Conference," 1952–1953, in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 910, Box 10, Folders 96–100. The RF annual reports indicate the rise of the behavioralist paradigm: in 1949. See Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report 1949* (New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1950), pp. 22–23, 57–60, 263–273, which calls for a behavioralist "synthesis" of all social sciences for the first time, even though in practice the foundation was still offering support for non-behavioralist approaches. See also Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report 1950* (New York: Rockefeller Foundation,

At the same time, the humanities were not altogether neglected. On the contrary, one of the RF's largest grants, and one of its most important contributions to the intellectual mobilization for the Cold War, went to a new kind of humanities endeavor that became a model for area studies institutions all over the United States: the Russian Institute at Columbia University, founded in 1946. Substantial RF support totaling $1.4 million was channeled through the foundation's humanities division, which cooperated closely with the social sciences division. This institutional arrangement underlined the RF policy that language, history, and culture—and not the behavioralist approach—would be at the core of Russian studies—or "Sovietology," as this integrated Cold War social science was soon called—and of the subsequent array of area studies programs that were established and supported by the RF.[21] RF officers designed humanities programs with a view to changing the scholarly landscape. Their tactics were to intervene at crucial moments in the formation of disciplines, viewing themselves as strategists in knowledge production and circulation. Their role differed considerably from the less powerful and interventionist administrators in institutions such as the German Research Council (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) at that time.[22]

1951), pp. 193–194, 203–204, 216–218. The entrenchment of behavioralist hegemony came in 1951. See Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report 1951* (New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1952), pp. 58–70, 330–388, which proclaims the age of behavioralism and subsumes all social science projects under the behavioralist paradigm. This hegemony did not last long, however. See Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report 1952* (New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1953), pp. 232–241. In subsequent years, support for behavioralist projects remained at a high level but was not exclusive. See Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report 1953,* pp. 248–256; and Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report 1954* (New York: Rockefeller Foundation, 1955), pp. 36–37, 207–209.

21. See Engerman, *Know Your Enemy,* p. 19. On the area studies discussion in the RF, see Memorandum from Fahs, "Area Studies: An Outline of Humanities Concern," 3 December 1948, in RFA, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 31, Folder 165; Memorandum from Fahs to Marshall, D'Arms, Gilpatric, 10 June 1949, in RFA, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 31, Folder 165; Memorandum from Marshall to Fahs et al., 27 June 1950, in RFA, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 31, Folder 165; Memorandum from Fahs to Rusk, 5 April 1954, in RFA, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 31, Folder 165; and "Area Studies in America," 31 August 1961, in RFA, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 31, Folder 165. See also Memorandum from Fahs, "A Reexamination of Rockefeller Foundation Program in Area Studies," 24 October 1954, in RFA, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 31, Folder 166; Board of Trustees, Minutes, 30 November–1 December 1954, Appendix II, "Widening Our Cultural Relations," in RFA, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 31, Folder 166; Wallace to Willits, 14 October 1950, in RFA, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 321, Folder 3825; and, "Pro-22: Marshall, The Near East," 13 November 1951, in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 911, Box 2, Folder 15.

22. See Corinna R. Unger, *Ostforschung in Westdeutschland: Die Erforschung des europäischen Ostens und die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2007), pp. 362, 380. On social sciences patronage by the RF and other philanthropies, see Hunter Heyck, "Patrons of the Revolution: Ideals and Institutions in Postwar Behavioral Science," *Isis,* Vol. 97, No. 3 (September 2006), pp. 420–446. On the RF's policy discussion, see, "Pro-16: Report to the Trustees' Committee on Humanities in American Institutions," 15 February 1943; "Pro-17: The Humanities Program of the Rockefeller Foundation," 15 April 1948, pp. 1–116; "Pro-18: Humanities: Excerpt from Plans for the Future Work of the Rockefeller Foundation, November 1944, used as basis for discussion at Trustees' meeting," 4 April 1945, pp. 61–76; "Pro-19: Humanities: Summary of Current Operations," 1 April 1949; "Pro-20: Stevens, 'Time in the Humanities Program,'" September 1949; John Marshall, "The Arts in

The Russian Institute is an important case that reveals the complexity and non-linearity of social science patronage and knowledge mobilization during the Cold War. This first center of Soviet studies was publicly presented as a place for building intercultural understanding while also serving as a Cold War institution within an intelligence and psychological warfare framework. The institute became the intellectual training ground for military officers and government experts and was at the same time attacked by anti-Communist forces. Deriving from the Russian division of the wartime Office of Strategic Services (OSS)—where the integrated, interdisciplinary, area studies approach, oriented toward (strategic) problems and policy needs instead of disciplinary interests, was in full bloom for the first time—the Russian Institute maintained close ties to the state apparatus.

The new institute employed a large number of former and unreconstructed leftists—among them OSS veteran and future student movement hero Herbert Marcuse—and was controlled by liberal Cold Warriors with close ties to the foreign policy establishment. Marcuse was a protégé of the ultimate Cold War insider, Philip E. Mosely, who was a government and RF consultant, director of the Council on Foreign Relations, and one of the leading Sovietologists of his generation. Mosely served as the institute's second director after Geroid T. Robinson, the Columbia professor who had been head of Russian research at the OSS. The Russian Institute was never a mere "agency of understanding," as the RF president called it at its inauguration. The two opposing global "systems of ideas and government," he argued, could not "work harmoniously together."[23] Neither was the Russian Institute a place of rampant anti-Communism. Rather, it was a stronghold of sophisticated, liberal Cold Warriors. That liberals were in charge, both in government and in philanthropy, was important.

The Political-Philanthropic Complex

Inherent in this sophisticated liberalism was both an academic-intellectual and a political-strategic quality, which implied a strong and vital interest in

the Humanities Program," 17/30 January 1950; Charles Burton Fahs, "The Program in the Humanities: Excerpt from Trustees' Confidential Report," February 1951, pp. 21–33; all in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 911, Boxes 2–3, Folders 14–25b.

23. Rockefeller Foundation, *Annual Report 1945,* p. 15. See also Engerman, *Know Your Enemy,* pp. 13–42; Unger, *Ostforschung in Westdeutschland,* pp. 352–358, 369–379; and Müller, *Krieger und Gelehrte,* pp. 219–243. For information on Cold War insiders, see Jeremi Suri, *Henry Kissinger and the American Century* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2007), pp. 109–130. On the OSS, see Barry M. Katz, *Foreign Intelligence: Research and Analysis in the Office of Strategic Services, 1942–1945* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989); Petra Marquardt-Bigman, *Amerikanische Geheimdienstanalysen über Deutschland 1942–1949* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1995); and Christof Mauch, *The Sha-*

intellectual diversity. A foundation that had such long-term ambitions and was as big as the RF could not risk being disconnected from important scientific and scholarly developments. However, this kind of liberalism also had a political-epistemological dimension. Acknowledging this dimension is crucial to a better understanding of the ideas behind the Cold War reconciliation of "national interest" and "scientific progress."[24]

The work of the Russian Institute and other Soviet studies centers, Mosely explained at a foundation meeting, was to be judged first on its scholarly merits. But at the same time—indeed, by virtue of the fact that these institutions represented the academic state of the art—they served to counteract and refute Soviet interpretations of socialist thought. The intellectual offensive waged with RF money could even "recapture the pathos of the labor movement for the democratic side."[25] Socialism was to be acknowledged and reformulated as a Western, anti-Soviet force—the creation of a specifically Western Marxism (which developed independently from RF intervention but still was able to benefit from it) was seen as a Cold War strategic resource. The geopolitical range of this strategy extended far beyond Europe. Soviet and Marxist studies could provide critical ideological support in the global struggle to win over "India and the Near East, where the Communists claim to be the only ones who have been interested for many years in the improvement of conditions generally."[26] According to this analysis, political debates in Europe or the Third World differed markedly from those in the United States, and so did the RF's approaches. Even if some RF-supported research on Marxism was produced on U.S. soil, it was—in the foundation officers' and strategists' minds—intended mainly for export.[27] This kind of research promotion later had unintended consequences even inside the United States.

dow War Against Hitler: The Covert Operations of America's Wartime Secret Intelligence Service (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002).

24. On similar efforts at balancing national security, social reform, and objectivity in World War Two, see Buxton, "John Marshall"; Gary, "Communication Research"; and, Gary, *The Nervous Liberals,* pp. 89–93, 102, 106–108.

25. Memorandum from Edward F. D'Arms, 13 October 1954, in RFA, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 322, Folder 3828.

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid. On Western Marxism, see the classic interpretations by Perry Anderson, *Considerations on Western Marxism* (London: New Left Books, 1976); Russell Jacoby, *Dialectics of Defeat: Contours of Western Marxism* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981); and Martin Jay, *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984). It would be a simplistic misreading of my argument to conclude that the RF program was behind the formation of Western Marxism. My point here is to show that the RF became interested in an intellectual development, recognized its potential as a Cold War resource (which was an intellectual and political achievement of its own), and participated in the promotion of these intellectual processes by supporting research and circulating books. On the limited but not negligible results of RF promotion, see Müller, *Krieger und Gelehrte,* pp. 489–538.

The development of a democratic socialism to woo states away from Soviet Marxism was one of many instances in which underlying Cold War objectives had intellectual implications. It was, in effect, a political epistemology with strategic aspirations—a dimension of thought shared by contemporary protagonists. Its meaning was made explicit by the intelligence apparatus that worked most closely with the RF (from 1945, when William Langer received one of the largest grants ever on a per-capita basis, until the late 1950s, when the RF consulted with intelligence analysts about the international Marxism-Leninism project mentioned below), the intelligence institution that was the direct successor to the interdisciplinary OSS research operations: the State Department's Office of Intelligence Research (OIR). This institution conveyed the self-image of a vanguard social science research organization, a quasi-cybernetic structure constantly monitored by the principle of autocorrection. Political and scholarly diversity was sought and encouraged, and dissent was welcomed for strategic purposes. The arrangement involved a set of discourses and professional roles connecting social science with social self-reflection, self-criticism, self-correction, and self-preservation. The OIR's director noted, "What is needed is a channel for informal ideas, for the posing of questions, for detecting the unexpected approach or element that might otherwise slip by."[28]

This political-epistemological self-description can be read as an example of what John Krige refers to as the "co-production of American hegemony." According to this concept, global U.S. leadership was intentionally formed and exercised through diversity and seemingly free but in fact hegemonically organized exchange in the realm of knowledge. The key players organizing and controlling this "co-production" of hegemony were the brokers of knowledge and power in intelligence and philanthropic institutions.[29]

The strategic rationale was thus reinforced with a high-modernist concept of scientific progress. Good science and scholarship and Western liberal values were conceived of as mutually interdependent. In the long run, both would converge, thus greatly minimizing the need to promote Western values by force. In terms of both scientific progress and political success, this was a highly self-confident, affirmative modernist stance advanced by a high-modernist, technocratic elite that thought it knew best. This twofold confidence was not confined to social science circles; it was evident immediately

28. Memorandum from Allan Evans to Park Armstrong, "Bissell Draft on Intelligence on Communism," 11 March 1955, pp. 13, 15, in U.S. National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), College Park, RG 59, Entry 1561, Box 8, Folder 4.

29. Krige, *American Hegemony,* pp. 1–14. See also John Krige, "Die Führungsrolle der USA und die transnationale Koproduktion von Wissen," in Bernd Greiner, Tim B. Müller, and Claudia Weber, eds., *Macht und Geist im Kalten Krieg* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2011), pp. 68–86.

after the war when the Harvard historian William Langer, who had been OSS research director and special assistant to the secretary of state for intelligence and research, set out to write his monumental history of World War Two. Only a "mature and experienced scholar" like himself—so explained Langer and his patrons in the RF and foreign policy circles—would be able to write a "comprehensive, authoritative history of the United States during these years of turmoil."[30] This history, in turn, just by being so objective and magisterially researched, would substantiate the liberal foreign policy establishment's view on the war and refute once and for all the isolationist interpretation in both its conservative and radical varieties as well as the competing Communist and British "imperialist" accounts.[31] There was no understanding of an irresolvable tension between national interests and impeccable scholarship. RF projects and officers were involved in producing the new national security discourse (even if the RF strategists, talking about "patriotic duties," were still learning and as yet not always well versed in the new idiom), but these policies were not meant to stifle scientific innovation or humanist originality.[32] To the contrary, in the early Cold War, innovation and originality were perceived as having both political and intellectual roots.

This political epistemology is also important in understanding the ambivalent political record of the RF in the early Cold War. On the one hand, we observe the formation of a political-philanthropic complex. On the other hand, the foundation kept its distance from and even resisted the forces of McCarthyism. The diaries of RF officials reveal that they met or communicated on a frequent, at times almost daily, basis with senior U.S. officials to discuss not just intercultural exchange programs.[33] At the core of these perma-

30. Langer, "The United States in the Second World War," 1 October 1945, in RFA, RG 1.2, Series 100 S, Box 58, Folder 444; and Langer, "A Project for the Preparation of a History of American Foreign Relations during the War Period (For Consideration of the Committee of Studies, Council on Foreign Relations)," 8 October 1945, in RFA, RG 1.2, Series 100 S, Box 58, Folder 444.

31. Langer, "The United States in the Second World War," 1 October 1945; Memorandum from Willits, 1 November 1945, in RFA, RG 1.2, Series 100 S, Box 58, Folder 444; Memorandum from Willits, 17 December 1945, in RFA, RG 1.2, Series 100 S, Box 58, Folder 444; Langer, "A Project for the Preparation of a History of American Foreign Relations during the War Period (For Consideration of the Committee of Studies, Council on Foreign Relations)," 8 October 1945; Langer to Mallory, 8 October 1945; Mallory to Langer, 23 October 1945; Langer to Mallory, 29 October 1945; CFR to Rockefeller Foundation, Proposal for a History of the United States in the Second World War, 21 December 1945, pp. 1–5; all in RFA, RG 1.2, Series 100 S, Box 58, Folder 444. Similar language appears in all the documents cited here.

32. On the national security state, discourse, and managers, see Michael J. Hogan, *A Cross of Iron: Harry S. Truman and the Origins of the National Security State, 1945–1954* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 1–22.

33. Extensive evidence of the political entanglements of the RF's humanities policies is provided by the records of Charles Burton Fahs, in RFA, RG 12.1, Officers' Diaries, Charles B. Fahs, Reel 1–7. Fahs was a historian of Japan and an OSS veteran who worked for the RF from 1946 to 1962. In 1950 he was promoted to the position of director of humanities.

nent negotiations was RF support for U.S. foreign policy. The sources indicate the close and sometimes surreptitious cooperation between philanthropic and political entities. The creation of area studies, in particular, did not just fill an academic gap—it was a response to government need. The United States again found itself "in a time of war," and the RF was willing to contribute to the intellectual mobilization.[34]

This, however, never meant that the RF was simply a passive actor, a willing agent of the U.S. government. Working too closely with government agencies was frowned upon within the foundation, and the people most heavily involved with foreign policy, such as the omnipresent Mosely, advised most strongly against such collaboration. Mosely wanted to keep the two worlds apart. Anti-Communist forces, he argued, should not necessarily prevail in internal discussions on philanthropic strategies. Independence from government was also a matter of professionalization in the philanthropic field.[35]

The RF and U.S. government represented distinct social systems committed to an identical overarching goal. Only by keeping its (semi-)independence from government interference could the RF be a successful player in the realm of global philanthropy and knowledge circulation. The common overarching interest was the consolidation and promotion of Western liberal modernity (and, as a consequence, U.S. hegemony), which was competing with state socialist approaches to modernization. This view of modernization largely coincided with the strategic vision of government experts and policymakers during the early Cold War. This technocratic, high-modernist liberal vision (and epistemology) of the 1950s and early 1960s transcended the prima facie tension between the two core principles underlying RF activities: "obligations to American government and to American national interest" were "axiomatic," while "within the limits they impose" the foundation's "reputation for disinterestedness in its international work" was furthered.[36] The

34. "Minutes Officers' Conference," 18 March 1948, in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 900, Box 25, Folder 199.

35. Note, for instance, the vivid discussion about the "Eurasia institute," the idea of an intelligence unit—staffed mainly with recent East European émigrés—under an RF-backed academic cover, an idea entertained by Policy Planning Staff Director George F. Kennan and former OSS boss William J. Donovan. See Mosely, "Memorandum on Eurasian Research Institute," 19 October 1948; Memorandum from Mosely to Willits, 24 November 1948; Memorandum from Willits to Barnard, 16 November 1948; Barnard to Donovan, 28 December 1948; all in RFA, RG 2, Series 200, Box 407, Folder 2744. See also, Engerman, *Know Your Enemy,* p. 40; and Bruce Cumings, "Boundary Displacement: Area Studies and International Studies during and after the Cold War," in Christopher Simpson, ed., *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences During the Cold War* (New York: The New Press, 1998), pp. 159–188. Cumings, in his otherwise insightful article, exaggerates the importance of this operation (pp. 164–165). The "Eurasia institute" hardly became the role model for area studies.

36. "Pro-51: Marshall, Relations of the Foundation with Governmental and Intergovernmental Agencies."

RF's "disinterestedness" was considered a strategic asset in fighting totalitarianism and in wooing critical European and Third World societies, because it gave evidence to the plurality and superiority of the Western social-liberal democratic system. In this way, any tension between the U.S. national interest and the foundation's interest in the "well-being of mankind" was dissolved.[37]

Efforts at reconciling academic freedom with national security show a similar picture. In the end the RF considered itself more committed to academic freedom, one of the core principles of its philanthropic activities. Nevertheless, for a brief moment in the early 1950s, RF definitions of academic freedom—even then not uncontested within the foundation—bordered on fervently anti-Communist, security-obsessed discourses. RF officials also ran obligatory security checks on applicants. However, they never succumbed to the rituals of self-purification so typical in the age of McCarthyism. Personal interrogations were rarely conducted, and by checking only the most official "anti-subversive" indices (on which applicants' names were more often not found than found) the RF was able to imply that it was shielding applicants from further public scrutiny.

If doubts about the political attitude of an applicant were raised, the verdict of the RF's network of elitist "close friends" outranked security concerns and public criticism—even if the name did appear on lists.[38] For reasons of professional principle and institutional self-interest, problems were solved on the political-epistemological level that linked scientific progress to Western political modernity. Leading RF officials concurred that

> apart from Communists and Fascists—where the presumption of incapacity for objective scholarly research can be made—RF makes and will make no inquiry into the political, social or religious beliefs of any applicant for Foundation aid. No scholar of repute would accept a Foundation grant if the Foundation attempted to carry on such investigations of applicants' beliefs and values.[39]

This was made the official RF policy in 1953. The repeated emphasis on the "importance of the non-conformist in the advancement of human thought" revealed the anti-Communist perspective shared by liberal Cold Warriors.[40]

37. Ibid. On social liberalism and its social visions from the 1940s through the late 1960s, see Brick, *Transcending Capitalism,* pp. 145–218.

38. DeVinney to Willits, Rusk, 20 January 1953, in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 900, Box 25, Folder 200.

39. Deane to Willits, 1 December 1952, in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 900, Box 25, Folder 200.

40. DeVinney to Willits, Rusk, 20 January 1953, in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 900, Box 25, Folder 200. See also Willits to Barnard, 19 September 1951, in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 900, Box 25, Folder 199; Kimball to Barnard, 20 August 1951; Fahs, "Questions for Discussion with CIB [Chester I. Barnard]," 31 August 1951; Barnard to Principal Officers, 12 September1951; Deane to Willits, 1 December 1952; DeVinney to Willits, Rusk, 20 January 1953; Willits to Rusk, 27 January 1953; Rusk to Robert B. Watson, 1 March 1954; all in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 900, Box 25, Folder 200; and Pro–46: Rusk,

Still, terms such as "subversive" or "un-American" were deemed counterproductive and dangerous to intellectual innovation.[41]

When the foundation came under attack, a 1954 memorandum from the director of social sciences, Joseph Willits, to RF President and former State Department official and future Secretary of State Dean Rusk expressed the foundation's most vital long-term interest: "The chief danger to be avoided is the discouragement by RF of new and adventurous thinking." Anything else was called "totalitarian":

> By preventing adventuring, and insisting on an official line, totalitarian societies shut themselves off from a rich crop of new ideas and one of the basic sources of growth. In combating Communism, it is important that the western world—and the RF as one of its best intellectual symbols—should not encourage the impoverishment of the stream of new ideas.[42]

This reaffirmation of principle was directed at the forces of McCarthyism. From 1952 to 1954, the U.S. congressional Select Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, steered first by a Southern Democrat, then by a Southern Republican, attacked the RF for its "internationalist bias" and its support of anti-segregationist efforts in the American South.[43] The foundation's reaction again linked the political to the epistemological. The RF unequivocally defended one of the main endeavors under attack, the Cornell Civil Liberties project, which was funded by the foundation's social science division. The Cornell project investigated government encroachment on civil rights from World War I through the 1950s. The resulting studies were academically impeccable and received critical acclaim, and even today they are consulted by scholars of McCarthyism. RF officials harbored no doubts about the value of this project.[44] A different fate befell the

"Notes on Rockefeller Foundation Program," 1 December 1953, in RFA, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 29, Folder 158. Overseas, RF officials occasionally conducted more intrusive inquiries. See Krige, *American Hegemony,* pp. 115–151.

41. Deane to Willits, 1 December 1952. This point is neglected by the otherwise magisterial studies on McCarthyism by Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower;* and Schrecker, *Many Are the Crimes,* pp. 404–411.

42. Willits to Rusk, 27 January 1953. See also Rusk to Watson, 1 March 1954.

43. On this and the following paragraph, see Schrecker, *Many Are the Crimes,* p. 407; and, Müller, *Krieger und Gelehrte,* pp. 293–312.

44. Willits to Robert M. Hutchins, 16 April 1952; Rusk to Robert Cushman, 18 June 1952; Willits to Cushman, 4 March 1953; Willits to Hutchins, 9 March 1954; all in RFA, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 327, Folder 3903. Among many highly favorable reviews was one by James R. Killian, the future science adviser to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who called a book written under the auspices of the Cornell project by the prominent constitutional lawyer Walter Gellhorn, "by all odds the best-informed, the most objective, and the most thorough study yet to appear of the effects of military secrecy and of loyalty tests on scientific progress in America." See review by James R. Killian, *Yale Review,* Winter 1951, pp. 330–331. For a similar review in a wider-circulation publication, see William S. Dutton, "Danger: We're Headed for a Russianized America," *Look,* 10 October 1950, pp. 91–98. On the lasting academic relevance of the project, see Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower,* p. 343; and Ellen

Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR), which was targeted by investigators from the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee under Senator Pat McCarran and was attacked by the pro-Kuomintang "China lobby."[45] In the 1930s the IPR had assembled the most influential network of businesspeople, scholars, and politicians dealing with East Asia, but it lost its academic relevance with the rise of area studies, and its substantial RF funding was gradually withdrawn in response to poor crisis management and the foundation's recognition that an "avowed Communist" sat on the IPR board.[46]

The RF finally waged a sharp and successful counterattack against the House committee, but only once it recognized that McCarthyism was in decline. The investigators had a clear definition of subversion—they probed "whether the foundations [had] used their resources to weaken, undermine, or discredit the American system of free enterprise either by criticism, ridicule, or pale praise."[47] The RF stated in contrast that the term "subversive" had no "generally accepted or recognized meaning but appears, rather, to have a wide variety of senses, depending upon the political and economic viewpoint of the user" and—in another effort at tactically or self-confidently connecting the political to the epistemological—explained that it relied on solid scientific standards that were "far beyond any definition of subversion."[48] The committee's attacks on the Russian Institute were rebutted by quoting President Dwight D. Eisenhower. An almost sneering comment followed: "Before the Committee itself condemns foundation support of an institution which is playing such a vital role in our defense against Communism, we respectfully suggest consultation with those who are responsible in executive capacities for the conduct of our foreign affairs and for the defense of the country."[49] In

Schrecker, *The Age of McCarthyism: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston: Little, Brown, 2002), pp. 293–294.

45. See Schrecker, *No Ivory Tower,* pp. 161–167, 182, 275–276; Schrecker, *Many Are the Crimes,* pp. 244–252; John N. Thomas, *The Institute of Pacific Relations: Asian Scholars and American Politics* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1974); Robert Griffith, *The Politics of Fear: Joseph R. McCarthy and the Senate* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1987), pp. 115–151; and Michael R. Anderson, "The Institute of Pacific Relations and the Struggle for the Mind of Asia," Ph.D. Diss., University of Texas-Austin, 2009.

46. Evans to Willits, Fosdick, 2 April 1946, in RFA, RG 1.1, Series 200, Box 352, Folder 4187; and "Supplemental Statement of the Rockefeller Foundation before the Special Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations, House of Representatives, 83rd Congress," 3 August 1954, Inv-4b, pp. 10–13, in RFA, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 16, Folder 93.

47. See "Additional Views of Angier L. Goodwin," 18 December 1953, in RFA, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 14, Folder 86. Goodwin was a representative from Massachusetts. The quotation excerpted in the RFA document is from a 1953 report released by the U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, Select Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations.

48. "Cox Committee: Answers of the Rockefeller Foundation" (written in response to "Questionnaire Submitted by the Select Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States"), 31 October 1952, pp. 52, 55–56, in RFA, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 14, Folder 89.

49. "Supplemental Statement of the Rockefeller Foundation," 3 August 1954, Inv-4b, pp. 3–4.

December 1954, Rusk publicly denounced the committee's final report as "largely discredited in advance by the procedures used in its 'investigation.'"[50] By then, Joseph McCarthy, his popularity and influence on the wane, had already been censured by the Senate. McCarthy's archenemy, Acheson, was among the first to congratulate the RF on its performance before the committee.[51]

The narrative of the RF in the Cold War is not linear. Close cooperation with government agencies was not equivalent to accommodating anti-Communist pressures. Instead, the story involves a complex set of sometimes conflicting and sometimes converging professional and political, epistemological and strategic rationales and practices.

Rockefeller Radicals: The Humanities in the Cold War

Among the less-well-known areas of the RF's Cold War engagement are the revitalization of political theory and intellectual history in America and the establishment of an international network for the study of Marxism—and the prominent participation of radical intellectuals in both endeavors. These two cases show how scholarly innovation and the promotion of Western social-liberal modernity (and, as a consequence, U.S. hegemony) were practically linked and conceived of as mutually interdependent in the 1950s and early 1960s.

A diagnosis of an intellectual rather than political insufficiency is what led to the creation of the RF's program in legal and political philosophy (LAPP) in late 1952. The program was organized by the social sciences division in close cooperation with the humanities division. The behavioralist revolution was to be counterbalanced by an intellectual counterrevolution—the RF decided that the wiser course was to diversify and to invest money in as many approaches as possible, and therefore "it was time that approaches other than the quantitative and behavioral be given some encouragement."[52]

From the beginning, numerous renowned political and social theorists were involved. The group consulted by the RF included prominent U.S.

50. Rusk, "Statement," 18 December 1954, in RFA, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 14, Folder 85.

51. Acheson to Rusk, 14 August 1954, in RFA, RG 3.2, Series 900, Box 16, Folder 96. Acheson wrote: "I thought it was extremely well done and admired the restraint and good temper, which must have been hard to maintain. It did two things, most difficult to combine. It presented affirmatively and with great intellectual vigor and enthusiasm the story of the Foundation's great achievements, and, at the same time, made the criticisms appear what they were—the peasant-like suspicions growing out of ignorance and know-nothingism. It was a good job."

52. Memorandum from Stewart, 12 April 1954, in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 910, Box 9, Folder 78.

scholars such as Louis Hartz, Frank Knight, and George Sabine, as well as the German-Jewish émigré socialist Franz Neumann, a former Frankfurt School affiliate and OSS and State Department analyst, who since 1947 had been a professor at Columbia University. Rusk himself oversaw the inauguration of the new—or, rather, rediscovered and redefined—field. Some of the most interesting and important texts and people in political theory and intellectual history evolved from this RF-directed setting, and it played a major role in the integration of émigré theorists and humanists into American academia. Critical reflection on modernity, the attack on U.S. complacency and "consensus history," and the introduction of psychoanalysis into political theory were notable features of some LAPP-funded works. A few of them—Marcuse's *One-Dimensional Man* and Otto Kirchheimer's *Political Justice,* to name two examples by émigré thinkers—became points of reference for some early New Left thinkers and student movement activists. Leftists were not the only beneficiaries of LAPP; Leo Strauss and his students were as well.[53]

Rusk's comments and his presence at the creation of this intellectual network point to the underlying political motivation. Political reflection had an intrinsic scholarly value, but it also simultaneously served Western self-understanding and thereby ideological affirmation. The revitalization of the great political tradition of the West would also make the West stronger in geostrategic terms. India and the Middle and Far East were identified as regions to be lastingly converted to the "democratic principles" elucidated and updated by political theory.[54]

A similar political motive lay behind the international project on Marxism-Leninism. This was not a typical Cold War project. Rather it was a vanguard scholarly endeavor transforming an entire disciplinary field while simultaneously generating intellectual support for psychological warfare.[55] Scholarly innovation and the promotion of Western ideological hegemony were from the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s linked to each other in subtle and sophisticated ways, even as the Marxism-Leninism network had both fulfilled its mission and lost its intellectual attraction. At the political-ideological

53. On the creation of LAPP, see "Proceedings, First Conference on Legal and Political Philosophy," 31 October–2 November 1952, 2 vols., in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 910, Box 9, Folders 81–82. For a list of publications funded by LAPP through 1962, see "The Rockefeller Foundation: Program in Legal and Political Philosophy 1953–1958," n.d. [1962], in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 910, Box 9, Folder 80. For an extensive discussion of the program and its intellectual effects, see Müller, *Krieger und Gelehrte,* ch. 4.

54. "Proceedings, First Conference on Legal and Political Philosophy," Vol. 1, pp. 82–85. See also, Rusk's comments in Minutes, Advisory Committee LAPP, 21 March 1955, in RFA, RG 3.1, Series 910, Box 9, Folder 78.

55. This reflects World War II experiences with communications research. See Buxton, "John Marshall"; and Gary, "Communication Research."

level the project sought to disarm the enemy's most dangerous intellectual weapon—Marxism—and even to turn the ideological arsenal of the antagonist against itself. No constraints, political or otherwise, were placed on the researchers involved, and even Marxists were recruited. The high-modernist, self-confident liberal epistemology was still in full bloom: intellectual diversity and innovation would produce the desired political results.[56]

European and U.S. institutions participated in this research complex from 1956 to 1964. Transnational cooperation had to be imposed by the RF on occasionally unwilling European grant recipients. The three main institutions involved were the Osteuropa-Institut at the Free University of Berlin, the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam, and the Eastern European Institute at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland. At the outset, Marcuse was commissioned to conduct a "pilot study" that would run from 1953 to 1954. His task was to survey the ideological terrain. In addition to ongoing research on "social science and political aspects" of Communism and the state socialist systems, attention was to be given to their "ideological elements, what these are, how they are formed and justified. Since dialectical materialism appears to gain part of its force through its ideas, these ideas deserve closer study and criticism than they have been given."[57]

Marcuse moved from the Russian Institute to the Russian Research Center (RRC) at Harvard University with a grant from the RF. The RRC was the second Soviet studies institution in the United States. In contrast to the Russian Institute, the RRC—where Parsonian and Weberian sociology was en vogue—was a stronghold of social science research on the Soviet Union. In its early days, its main patrons were the U.S. Air Force and the Carnegie Corporation. The RRC was closely linked to psychological warfare institutions, and it was the most innovative place to be for those interested in Soviet studies.[58] Marcuse's RF-supported project, begun at Columbia and continued at Harvard, was finally turned into a book, *Soviet Marxism* (1958), which was expected to deliver "a better understanding of the role which philosophy plays in Russian decisions and action."[59]

The book did so by intricately linking political prognosis to an original

56. For extensive references and a detailed discussion of this project and of Marcuse's contribution to it, see Müller, *Krieger und Gelehrte,* ch. 5.

57. Memorandum from Gilpatric, 16 July 1953, in RFA, RG 1.2, Series 200, Box 344, Folder 3138. On behavioralist research pertaining to Communism and its neglect or psychological reduction of ideological aspects, see Robin, *The Making of the Cold War Enemy.*

58. On the Russian Research Center, see Engerman, *Know Your Enemy,* pp. 43–70. On the vanguard discussion of the Soviet Union as a modern society, in which RRC researchers such as Barrington Moore set the tone, see ibid., pp. 180–205.

59. Fahs to Wild, 16 December 1953; and Memorandum from Gilpatric, 12 December 1953, both in RFA, RG 1.2, Series 200, Box 344, Folder 3138.

discussion of theoretical issues. "Marxism becomes subject to a historical dynamic which surpasses the intentions of the leadership and to which the manipulators themselves succumb," Marcuse explained. Hence, an "immanent discussion of Soviet Marxism may help to identify this historical dynamic to which the leadership itself is subjected—no matter how autonomous and totalitarian it may be."[60] In even more explicit terms, Marcuse claimed the book was "not concerned with abstract-dogmatic validity but with concrete political and economic trends, which may also provide a key for anticipating prospective developments."[61] Marcuse examined how Soviet leaders perceived the international and national situation in the volatile world after Stalin's death in 1953 and the 1956 upheavals. *Soviet Marxism* promised to give "an indication of the way in which the Soviet leadership interprets and evaluates the changing historical situation as the framework for its policy decisions" and revealed the "contradictory interests" within the alleged totalitarian monolith, showing the social differentiation of the Soviet system.[62] The book was characterized by the bureaucratic competition between the "economic, political, and military establishments," all of which aspired to "social control" and the "monopolization of power." As a result, Soviet society suffered from "personal and clique influences and interests, corruption, and profiteering."[63]

In addition to his social analysis—clearly influenced by his friend and colleague Barrington Moore—Marcuse focused on the ideological dynamic behind the social and political transformation of the Soviet system. Communist ideology, still an instrument of domination, could turn into a force for political reform and social development because it contained not only the promise of a better society but gave rational standards by which the Soviet citizens could measure the degree of progress in their society. "The ritualized language preserves the original content of Marxian theory as a truth that must be believed and enacted against all evidence to the contrary."[64] In the long run, however, the Marxist ideology would become dangerous to "Soviet rulers" resisting reform. "The definition of communism in terms of a production and distribution of social wealth according to freely developing individual needs, in terms of a quantitative and qualitative reduction of work for the necessities, of the free choice of functions" gave the Soviet people a powerful ideological weapon. "These notions," Marcuse continued, "certainly appear

60. Herbert Marcuse, *Soviet Marxism: A Critical Analysis* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958), p. 9. The introduction to the 1958 edition, spelling out the work's political implications, was omitted from the 1961 edition of the book.

61. Ibid.

62. Ibid., pp. 11, 108.

63. Ibid., pp. 111, 113–114.

64. Ibid., p. 89.

to be unrealistic in the light of the present state of affairs. But in themselves they are rational; moreover, technical progress and the growing productivity of labor make evolution toward this future a rational possibility."[65] Already in 1954 Marcuse expected the "technocratic development" of a "totalitarian welfare state" and a future convergence of Eastern and Western systems.[66] In the preface to the 1961 Vintage edition of his book, he offered a bold détente reading of Soviet developments: "The trend toward reform and liberalization within the Soviet Union has continued."[67]

Marcuse is an excellent case in point for the liberal political epistemology of the 1950s as represented by RF officials. His work belonged to both the world of psychological warfare–related policy analysis and the world of intellectually innovative, Western-Marxist critical theory. This ambivalence was also reflected in his career. An expert on Communism and a specialist on psychological warfare, he left the State Department in late 1951 as chair of the OIR committee on world Communism. He and his colleagues had emphasized the need to understand the thinking of the opposing side in order to predict its moves and, ultimately, defeat it. Their studies, memoranda, and reports on Communism had warned against an aggressive U.S. policy: The best defense against Communism, they argued, was the improvement of living standards in the West. Their intelligence analysis was informed by a New Deal social reform agenda, and the enemy they depicted was not a totalitarian monolith. Communist movements all over the world had their own local agendas that were beyond Moscow's control and in some cases even contrary to Soviet policies.[68] Analysts at the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) more often than not agreed with these conclusions. The "intelligence community" came to be part of the "epistemic community."[69]

65. Ibid., p. 265.

66. Herbert Marcuse, "Recent Literature on World Communism," *World Politics,* Vol. 6, No. 1 (September 1954), pp. 515–525, esp. 520.

67. Herbert Marcuse, *Soviet Marxism: A Critical Analysis* (New York: Vintage, 1961), p. vi.

68. See R&A 4909, "The Potentials of World Communism: Summary Report," 1 August 1949; R&A 5217 R, "Estimate of Current Strengths and Prospects of Western European Communists," 4 December 1950; both in NARA, RG 59, Final Reports of the Research and Analysis Branch, M-1221; and CWC Draft, "The Impact of Titoism and Other Deviations on Post-War International Communism," 6 January 1949, in NARA, RG 59, Entry 1561, Box 20, Folder OIR 1949–1950. See also, OIR 5219, "Deviation: Satellites," May 1950, in NARA, RG 59, Entry 5514, Box 12; OIR 5483, "Communist Defections and Dissensions in the Postwar Period," 22 June 1951, in NARA, RG 59, Entry 5514, Box 12; and Memorandum from Marcuse to CWC Representatives, "OIR Report on Defections from the Communist Party," 9 March 1951, in NARA, RG 59, Entry 1561, Box 20, Folder CWC 1951.

69. See Kai Bird, *The Color of Truth: McGeorge and William Bundy: Brothers in Arms* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1998), pp. 172–179; and Gerald K. Haines and Robert E. Leggett, eds., *Watching the Bear: Essays on CIA's Analysis of the Soviet Union* (Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency, 2004).

The intrinsic logic of psychological warfare—always on the lookout for cracks in the social fabric of enemy regimes—led to some of the earliest comparative studies of socialist societies in the East and in the colonial and postcolonial worlds.[70] The theory of totalitarianism never reigned supreme in the agencies of psychological warfare. Academic institutions with close ties to the intelligence apparatus, first and foremost Harvard's RRC, produced systematic rebuttals of totalitarianism theory, including books such as *Soviet Politics* (1950) and *Terror and Progress* (1954), both by Barrington Moore; and the classic *How the Soviet System Works* (1956), originally commissioned by the U.S. Air Force and edited by Raymond Bauer, Alex Inkeles, and Clyde Kluckhohn. Kluckhohn was the first RRC director and was responsible for the Soviet sections of "Project Troy," an important review of psychological strategy in the early Cold War. He also recruited Marcuse, whose *Soviet Marxism* complemented the research done at the center. For all its subdued Marxism, the book originated from the discourses of psychological warfare, and it extended assumptions and findings of Marcuse's colleagues at the RRC. Social scientific innovation and political objectives went together. The liberal political horizon of the late 1940s, 1950s, and early 1960s combined psychological offensive and a long-term détente policy. Both strategies drew intellectually on the RRC's work. Marcuse later became an important figure in the history of anti-Soviet Western Marxism, and the Soviet studies revisionism of the 1960s started with these early Cold War predecessors.[71]

In a similar vein, the transatlantic annex of this research complex, the RF's Marxism-Leninism project, also dismissed the concept of totalitarianism and introduced to Germany modern, comparative social science studies of the Soviet Union. The project also continued the continental traditions of meticulous, archive-based historical research and rigorous philosophical investigation, traditions held in high esteem by RF officials and perceived of as lacking in the United States. Distinctions were drawn between Marxism, Leninism,

70. On the Third World, see, for example, OIR 4909.4, "The Potentials of World Communism: Middle and Near East," Part I: The Arab League States, Part II: India, 1 August 1949, Part I: The Arab League States, Part II: India; OIR 4909.5, "The Potentials of World Communism: Far East," Part I: Japan, Part II: Indonesia, Part III: Indochina, Part IV: China, 1 August 1949, and OIR 4909.5, "The Potentials of World Communism: Latin America," Part I: Cuba, 1 August 1949, all in NARA, RG 59, Entry 5514, Box 9.

71. Barrington Moore, Jr., *Soviet Politics—The Dilemma of Power: The Role of Ideas in Social Change* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1950); Barrington Moore, Jr., *Terror and Progress—USSR: Some Sources of Change and Stability in the Soviet Dictatorship* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954); and Raymond A. Bauer, Alex Inkeles, and Clyde Kluckhohn, *How the Soviet System Works: Cultural, Psychological, and Social Themes* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959). On the disciplinary relevance of these books, see Stephen F. Cohen, *Rethinking the Soviet Experience: Politics and History since 1917* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. 28–30; Abbott Gleason, *Totalitarianism: The Inner History of the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 126–137; and Engerman, *Know Your Enemy*, pp. 180–205, 206–232.

and Stalinism, and with the events of 1956 the age of research on the post-Stalinist Soviet Union was inaugurated.[72] All of this research contributed to a reservoir of expert knowledge that could be mobilized by the advocates of "rational hope" and early détente policies, such as Charles Bohlen.[73]

This reveals once more the ambiguities of Cold War social scientific research and scholarship on the Soviet Union. Some of it worked intentionally or functionally toward a reduction of tensions and, in the end, toward transcending the Cold War order.[74] Theoretical conceptions were shared in different degrees by radical intellectuals, foundation officials, and liberal policymakers alike. Their *Erwartungshorizont* was shaped by theories of modernization. In its most explicit form, these expectations were theories of convergence. Convergence was "the central leitmotif of all modernization theory," its "historiological kernel."[75]

Modernization theory as an intellectual metanarrative was reformulated by a variety of modernization theories that shared certain fundamental assumptions about socioeconomic change but differed as to what role the state and social experts should play in social change and which sectors or systems of society would lead the development toward modernity, if modernization did not mean the total and simultaneous change of society.[76]

72. See Werner Philipp to D'Arms, 27 June 1956, in RFA, RG 1.2, Series 717, Box 7, Folder 82; and A. J. C. Rüter to Fahs, 31 October 1957, in RFA, RG 1.2, Series 650, Box 7, Folder 76.

73. On U.S. foreign policy in the 1950s and the rise of "rational hope" and détente strategies, see Gregory Mitrovich, *Undermining the Kremlin: America's Strategy to Subvert the Soviet Bloc, 1947–1956* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), pp. 85–95, 97–114, 160–176; Melvyn P. Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1993), pp. 355–360, 442, 485–493, 499; Melvyn P. Leffler, *For the Soul of Mankind: The United States, the Soviet Union, and the Cold War* (New York: Hill & Wang, 2007), pp. 123–126, 145–146, 182–192; and Kenneth Osgood, *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006). Bohlen occasionally used OIR documents, and researchers associated with the RRC participated in policy discussions such as "Project Troy" and the "Soviet Vulnerabilities Project." Mosely was a consultant for many government agencies concerned with foreign policy issues. Marshall Shulman of the Russian Institute, who was earlier an RRC scholar, rose to prominence at the U.S. State Department in the administration of President Jimmy Carter. See Gleason, *Totalitarianism,* p. 192; and, Leffler, *For the Soul of Mankind,* p. 295. Shulman supported the publication of Marcuse's *Soviet Marxism.* See Shulman to Gilpatric, 4 May 1956, and Shulman to Gilpatric, 18 May 1956, both in RFA, RG 1.2, Series 200, Box 344, Folder 3138. Similarly, Peter Christian Ludz, a young West German member of the RF's Marxism-Leninism project, became a leading government adviser in the years of Willy Brandt's *Ostpolitik.*

74. I do not mean to imply that all knowledge produced in the state apparatus or in think tanks was highly sophisticated. More often than not, defense intellectuals and intelligence analysts followed the political agenda of their superiors and donors and provided them with arguments legitimating their actions. See Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future,* pp. 155–202; Bruce Kuklick, *Blind Oracles: Intellectuals and War from Kennan to Kissinger* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006); and Robin, *The Making of the Cold War Enemy.*

75. Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future,* pp. 221, 234–235.

76. Ibid., pp. 1–23, 57, 74–76, 100–103, 190–202, 221–222, 234–235. See also Engerman, "The Romance of Economic Development and New Histories of the Cold War," *Diplomatic History,* Vol. 28, No. 1 (Winter 2004), pp. 23–54; Heyck, "Moderne und sozialer Wandel"; Wolfgang Knöbl,

Economic and social development indicated a convergence of the two antagonistic systems: rapid industrialization would end in processes of automation, and knowledge-based economies would supersede heavy industry–based economies. Ever more "affluent societies" would free their citizens from the burden of production and enable individuals to develop their creative potential. This set of ideas is usually associated with names such as John Kenneth Galbraith and Daniel Bell. However, Talcott Parsons had already united all elements of the postcapitalist vision, a main current of social-liberal thought that had anticipated this kind of outcome since the 1920s. In the 1960s, sociology made these assumptions more explicit and gave them further empirical plausibility. That was also the social horizon shared in the 1950s by leftist social critics such as C. Wright Mills and Marcuse, even if they soon started to evoke the emergence of a negative convergence. There were distinctions, no doubt, but there was a stable and ever more influential (albeit politically ever more de-radicalized) post-capitalist and post-industrial discourse from the 1920s to the late 1960s, when the social-liberal vision collapsed.[77]

Applied to the Soviet Union and its state socialist realm, modernization also meant that a new class of knowledgeable bureaucrats had succeeded Stalinist autocracy. Both East and West were now ruled by more or less enlightened technocrats. Already in the 1950s, many features of high-modernist technocracy were shared across the Cold War divide. The presumed interdependence of political, social, and economic change, a cornerstone of modernization theory, implied that increasing political liberalization would follow in the East and that the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe would in the long run move closer toward the politically liberal Western model of modernization—which remained the underlying model for most convergence theorists. Some, however, proved not to be that patient and became foreign policy hawks. Most prominent of these was Walt Rostow, who soon propagated the acceleration of modernization by military means.[78] Modernization theories had dif-

Spielräume der Modernisierung: Das Ende der Eindeutigkeit (Weilerswist, Germany: Velbrück, 2001); and Peter Wagner, *Moderne als Erfahrung und Interpretation: Eine neue Soziologie zur Moderne* (Konstanz: Universitätsverlag Konstanz, 2009).

77. This is the key argument advanced by Howard Brick, and he gives ample evidence to support it. See Brick, *Transcending Capitalism.* See also Howard Brick, *Age of Contradiction: American Thought and Culture in the 1960s* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), pp. 1–7, 22, 54–57, 125–136; Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future,* pp. 72–112; Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud* (1955; Boston: Beacon Press, 1966), pp. 36–39, 149–158, 217–218, 223–225; and Daniel Geary, *Radical Ambition: C. Wright Mills, the Left, and American Social Thought* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2009). An inverted or negative convergence theory (East and West as totally administered, "one-dimensional," late-industrial societies) is advanced in Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964).

78. See, Moore, *Terror and Progress,* pp. 179–231; Marcuse, "Recent Literature on Communism"; and Marcuse, *Soviet Marxism* (1961), pp. 85–103, 171–172. On conceptions of East-West convergence,

ferent faces. Discredited as intellectual rationalizations of Third World interventions, they possessed a détente quality with regard to the Soviet sphere of influence.[79]

Such was the appearance of the larger intellectual horizon of RF activities in the social sciences and humanities during the early Cold War. Theories of modernization changed over time, and in the late 1960s they rapidly lost intellectual attraction. Nevertheless, they shaped the intellectual and political vision of philanthropic and political protagonists in the period under consideration, and they served institutions such as the RF as an intellectual framework from the late 1940s to the late 1960s. Theories of modernization laid the fundamental conceptual foundations of the liberal political epistemology of the early Cold War. Strategic vision and high-modernist concepts of scientific progress coincided. Good social science scholarship and Western liberal values were perceived to be mutually interdependent. The common overarching interest was the consolidation and promotion of Western social-liberal modernity and, as an indirect consequence, U.S. global hegemony. The ambivalent philanthropic practices of the RF were the result of this discourse and its institutional settings.

Ambivalence, however, also implies that diversity mattered, that intellectual interests could trump all political considerations, and that consequences could differ considerably from intentions. A mark of good scholarship was to transcend rather than simply replicate political contexts. The liberal officers of the RF extended their support for unconventional scholars far beyond the needs of Cold War strategy. Intellectual curiosity was part of their professional role.[80]

see Engerman, "The Romance of Economic Development"; Engerman, *Know Your Enemy,* pp. 180–205; Brick, *Transcending Capitalism;* Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future,* pp. 100–103, 221–222, 234–235; Nils Gilman, "Modernization Theory, the Highest Stage of American Intellectual History," in David C. Engerman et al., eds., *Staging Growth: Modernization, Development, and the Global Cold War* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003), pp. 47–80; Gabriele Metzler, *Konzeptionen politischen Handelns von Adenauer bis Brandt: Politische Planung in der pluralistischen Gesellschaft* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2005), pp. 225–231; David Milne, *America's Rasputin: Walt Rostow and the Vietnam War* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2008); and Cohen, *Rethinking the Soviet Experience,* pp. 30–33.

79. See, first of all, Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future.* On modernization as a foreign policy doctrine, see also Michael Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000). On Third World application, see Bradley R. Simpson, *Economists with Guns: Authoritarian Development and U.S.-Indonesian Relations, 1960–1968* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2008). For an otherwise excellent discussion of modernization theories that neglects their long-term function as foreign policy framework, see Knöbl, *Spielräume der Modernisierung.*

80. The appreciation and protection Marcuse enjoyed is visible in an extraordinary assessment. When Marcuse, by then a professor at Brandeis University, set out to write his *One-Dimensional Man* in the late 1950s, he again received a Rockefeller grant. On this occasion, Mosely was sure that "anything" his friend Marcuse "completes will be both significant and provocative": "I feel that Marcuse has a su-

A Tale of Two Modernities

The role of the RF in the Cold War is probably best described not as that of an agent of American foreign policy but as an agent or patron of modernization—a process conceptualized as an elite-controlled social transformation that would lead the world to social conditions similar to those in the United States in the 1950s. The process of modernization entailed the rise of modern social sciences, and the RF defined its mission as promoting scientific and scholarly innovation in line with these conceptions of modernity. Scientific progress and liberal modernity were conceived of as intrinsically linked to each other.[81]

This self-perception can be contextualized within recent interpretations of the Cold War. "In linking high modernism in architecture and city planning to defense needs and mobilization of labor resources," writes Odd Arne Westad, "the Cold War became the apotheosis of twentieth-century modernity."[82] Authors like Westad emphasize that the core of the conflict was, though overshadowed by a nuclear standoff, a competition between two models of modernization, both of them characterized by the technocratic "rule by experts."[83] The Cold War was a "conflict between the two versions of Western modernity that socialism and liberal capitalism seemed to offer." The latter was through the 1970s marked by consumer capitalism, welfare democracy, and socially committed markets—in short, the New Deal–inspired social–liberal democratic model. The state socialist way of modernization was characterized by centrally planned economies and open political repression. The global attraction of the two models was largely dependent upon their success in stabilizing economies and raising living standards. This competition between two concepts of modernization was played out not only in Europe but also increasingly in the Third World, one of the most contested battlegrounds of the global Cold War.[84]

perior mind and I would be glad to back him in any project he undertakes, except possibly space flight!" See Mosely to Thompson, 6 March 1959, in RFA, RG 1.2, Series 200, Box 481, Folder 4113.

81. On the larger background of this development, see Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Theodore M. Porter and Dorothy Ross, eds., *The Modern Social Sciences,* Vol. 7 in *The Cambridge History of Science* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Lutz Raphael, "Die Verwissenschaftlichung des Sozialen als methodische und konzeptionelle Herausforderung für eine Sozialgeschichte des 20. Jahrhunderts," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft,* Vol. 22, No. 2 (1996), pp. 165–193; and Peter Wagner, *Sozialwissenschaften und Staat: Frankreich, Deutschland und Italien 1870–1980* (Frankfurt: Campus, 1990).

82. Westad, "The Cold War and the International History of the Twentieth Century," pp. 16–17.

83. Ibid., p. 17.

84. Ibid., p. 10. Westad uses the term "Western" synonymously with "occidental," whereas I always use the terms "West" and "Western" to refer to the political-economic Western bloc led by the United States in the Cold War. See also Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions*

Philanthropic engagement no doubt strengthened the representations and practices of Western modernization. RF policies contributed to the intellectual and scientific diversity and innovation that finally rendered the Western model more attractive in the global arena. The political and philanthropic processes were not congruent. However, they were never as closely synchronized and as easily equalized as in the early Cold War. On the basis of high-modernist self-perceptions, the RF reconciled its two missions of functioning as a Cold War institution that promoted American hegemony and of serving as an internationalist philanthropic organization that promoted scientific progress and the "well-being of mankind." Within the intellectual and political framework of the period from the 1940s to the late 1960s, the two missions largely—and coincidentally—converged.

This historical constellation in the West came to an end sometime in the 1970s for a variety of reasons (a detailed discussion of which is beyond the scope of this article). As countless historians and economists have observed, the world, at least on the level of economic structures, was changed by the collapse of the Bretton Woods system, the 1973 and 1979 oil crises and inflation that brought an end to a seemingly endless postwar boom, and the global rise of digital financial capitalism. The story of the RF and its social sciences and humanities patronage offers insight into the normative core of this constellation. Its intellectual-political center disintegrated even before economic shocks produced their global structural consequences. The politically pluralist, social-liberal framework collapsed for various reasons—not least as an unintended result of its success in creating a "modern," more liberal, individualistic, and differentiated society freed from utter economic want, a society that could no longer be integrated by a single universal modernization narrative. Politically, the renewed New Deal social reformism in its "Great Society" version tied itself to an increasingly unpopular war in Southeast Asia. The almost already forgotten anti-Communist militancy of liberal social reform became again visible with a vengeance. Social liberalism lost its credibility and legitimacy. The social liberal political leadership of the United States risked an economic crisis when it wanted to reform society and wage an undeclared war at the same time. Vietnam disconnected the New Left generation from the political center.

On the opposite side of the political spectrum, the resurgence of market radicalism marked the formation of a new ideological center. Neoliberal capitalism and leftist counterculture were united in the libertarian critique of state-led social reform. Most important, the globalization accelerated by the

and the Making of Our Times (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Leffler and Westad, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Cold War;* Leffler, *For the Soul of Mankind;* and Simpson, *Economists with Guns.*

Cold War transcended and weakened the nation-state, the classic realm of modernization and liberal social reform that were key features of high modernity. The grand narrative of modernization collapsed and became the object of severe criticism. Political liberalism, in its twentieth-century New Deal or social-liberal variety, was no longer the all-encompassing force for political integration that it had been for more than two—in the United States, almost four—decades.[85]

As a consequence, the historically contingent coincidence of political and intellectual interests that characterized the RF's promotion of the social sciences and humanities in the early Cold War would no longer work. Therefore, the RF and other philanthropic foundations were forced to reorient and depoliticize their missions. (Social) sciences promotion continued, but with the rise of the National Science Foundation in 1950, the *Sputnik* "shock" of 1957, and the 1958 National Defense Education Act, a second system of science patronage arose, becoming dominant by the late 1960s, as Hunter Heyck shows, with more direct federal money and state intervention involved than before and with a smaller role to play for philanthropies such as the RF. The early Cold War patronage system's "focus on problems appealed to patrons with concrete problems to solve, and, since real-world problems do not respect disciplinary lines, it simultaneously encouraged the 'reintegration of the social sciences' that their leaders so ardently desired."[86] This patronage system coincided intellectually with the rise of the behavioral sciences, structural-functional systems theory, interdisciplinary studies, and modernization theories. The second patronage system no longer promoted the high-modernist integration of the social sciences. Rather, patronage agencies

> consciously sought to promote research that would advance the several social sciences as disciplines, especially work that would lead to methodological or instrumental advance. As a group, they held no brief for or against any particular conceptual scheme, problem area, or philosophical stance, so long as the research being proposed was methodologically sophisticated.[87]

85. I follow here mainly Brick, *Transcending Capitalism,* pp. 219–246, 255–256; Daniel T. Rodgers, *Age of Fracture* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2011); Michael Bernstein, *A Perilous Progress: Economists and Public Purpose in Twentieth-Century America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), pp. 148–156; Anselm Doering-Manteuffel and Lutz Raphael, *Nach dem Boom: Perspektiven auf die Zeitgeschichte seit 1970* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010); Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future,* pp. 203–240; Jonathan Bell, "Social Politics in a Transoceanic World in the Early Cold War Years," *Historical Journal,* Vol. 53, No. 4 (2010), pp. 401–421; and Michael Hochgeschwender, *Freiheit in der Offensive? Der Kongress für kulturelle Freiheit und die Deutschen* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1998).

86. Heyck, "Patrons of the Revolution," p. 433.

87. Ibid., p. 434.

The decomposition of modernization narratives and social-liberal visions of social progress, however, did not mean that all of their elements were made historically invalid, nor should this fact blur the historian's view of the complex social potentialities of this mid-twentieth-century reform age. Even astute critics of high-modernist elitism and social-liberal complacency have argued that in retrospect "some vision of a global welfare state remains the best defense of the Enlightenment as a global ideal." For all its authoritarian tendencies, and for all the destructive ramifications in parts of the postcolonial world, the early Cold War was, more than anything else, an age of liberal social reform in the West. As one of the finest intellectual historians of the period reasons, the political deficiencies are evident, but still the "aim must be to actualize the best parts of 1950s modernization theory."[88] This is a legacy of an era that was not least shaped by modernization-oriented, globally active philanthropies such as the Rockefeller Foundation, by institutions and networks committed to U.S. hegemony but not completely determined by it. The ideas and practices visible in the foundation's operations refine our understanding of the ambiguities of the Cold War.

Acknowledgments

My most grateful thanks are owed to Martin Bauer, Howard Brick, David Engerman, Matthew Karasiewicz, John Krige, Kiran Patel, and the anonymous reviewers of the JCWS.

88. Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future,* p. 276. See also Brick, *Transcending Capitalism,* p. 270: "The task remains of shaping a viable successor to the midcentury postcapitalist vision, one that takes seriously 'transitional' strategies for charting a path beyond capitalism, that is, one that recognizes the potential for socializing change in the present without falling back on undue confidence in the given trends of development."

Copyright of Journal of Cold War Studies is the property of MIT Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.